



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,543	12/17/2001	Markus Muck	CR00511P	2818
23125	7590	03/07/2005	EXAMINER	
FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. LAW DEPARTMENT 7700 WEST PARMER LANE MD:TX32/PL02 AUSTIN, TX 78729			FLANAGAN, KRISTA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/023,543	MUCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krista M. Flanagan	2631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,6-9 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/17/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/17/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Oath/Declaration

2. Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 1, reference characters 110, 120, and 130. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
4. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Art Unit: 2631

The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it refers to purported merits, includes speculative applications of the invention and compares the invention with the prior art.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 2631

7. The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 7 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: Regarding claim 7, please change "OFDM" to "Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplex (OFDM)". Regarding claim 9, it is the examiner's opinion that the claim should be dependent upon claim 8, not claim 7. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1, 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

11. Regarding the claims 1 and 11, it is stated that the second comparator means is coupled to receive the output of the first adder and the first path metric, where figure 3 and specification pages 7, lines 25-27 specify that the second comparator means is coupled to receive the output of the first adder and the second path metric. Claims 1 and 11 claims are misdescriptive of the disclosed subject matter.

Art Unit: 2631

12. Regarding claim 2, it is stated that the claim is dependant upon claim 1 but the claim then fails to further limit claim 1. It seems to claim the prior art (figure 2) with no limitations concerning the disclosed novelty. Claim 2 is misdescriptive.

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding the claim, first, second, third and fourth adder means are claimed for receiving a first metric, a second metric, a first branch metric and a second branch metric but there is no further limitation in the claims or the specification as to which adder receives which metric or branch metric value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by FR 2,769,434 to Baek Jong Sup.

17. Regarding claim 4, Baek Jong discloses a method of producing metrics for use in a Viterbi decoder comprising selecting metrics such that for at least some trellis transitions a branch metric is zero, whereby a simplified Add-compare select butterfly unit may be used (See page 9, lines 14-27).

18. Regarding claim 5, which inherits all of the limitations of claim 4, Baek Jong discloses a method of producing metrics for use in a Viterbi decoder wherein the metrics are selected by subtracting from each of a predetermined set of metrics a chosen one thereof to produce a resultant set of metrics having at least one zero value (See abstract, lines 4-10 and page 9, lines 14-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,769,434 to Baek Jong as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of "Self Correcting codes conquer noise Part One: Viterbi Codecs" by Syed Shahzad, Saqih Yaqub, and Faiseal Suleman, Chameleon Logics. Baek Jong does not explicitly state that the Viterbi decoder is adapted for code rates of the type $R = k/m$, where $k > 1$, and k and m are integers. However, from the Viterbi Codecs article on page 132 in the Viterbi-Codec Definitions panel, we note that the definition of "code rate" states that typical code rate values are $1/2$, $1/3$, and $2/3$ and that the error correction capability and hardware complexity increase as the code rate decreases. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt

Art Unit: 2631

the Viterbi decoder for code rates of the type $R = k/m$, where $k > 1$, and k and m are integers to provide increased error correction.

Allowable Subject Matter

21. Claims 3, 6-9, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art does not disclose the claimed subject matter in combination with the rejected independent claims.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. U.S. Patent No. 5,327,440 to Frederickson et al. discloses a Viterbi trellis coding methods and apparatus for direct access storage.
- b. U.S. Patent No. 5,928,378 to Choi discloses an add-compare-select processor in a Viterbi decoder.
- c. U.S. Patent No. 5,291,499 to Behrens et al. discloses a method and apparatus for reduced complexity Viterbi type sequence detectors
- d. U.S. Patent No. 5,530,707 to Lin discloses an area efficient decoder for rate k/n convolutional codes and other high rate trellis codes.


23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista M. Flanagan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2203.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad H. Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kmf
20050228


TESEAL D. BOCURE
PRIMARY EXAMINER